UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,434	04/15/2004	Hyun-Sik Yoon	Q80016	6309

23373	7590	02/10/2009

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
TAN, ALVIN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

Advisory Action *Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief*	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/824,434	YOON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ALVIN H. TAN	2173

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>14 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

      NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-37*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Tadesse Hailu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applied art still teaches the claim elements. Regarding independent claim 1, Applicant alleges that Iverson (U.S. Patent No. 6,957,075 B1) and Zancho (U.S. Patent No.,814,798) do not explicitly teach or suggest a UI support module operable to search the input/output storing unit for a specific input/output module of one of the respective users, wherein the UI support module comprises an input/output selecting unit including a mapping of each of the respective users with corresponding at least one of the stored input/output modules. Contrary to Applicant's arguments, Iverson discloses that an applicance personality is modified based, at least in part, on the current location/location type of the electronic appliance [column 3, lines 36-56]. Iverson suggests associating an appliance personality based on a particular user, by disclosing that a need exists for automatically adjusting an applicance's user interface based on location or user [column 2, lines 11-14]. Further, an appliance may also tailor the user interface and device personality based on whether a user is visually impaired or hearing imparied [column 12, lines 14-25]. Iverson does not expressly teach wherein the UI support module includes a mapping of each of the respective users with corresponding at least one of the stored input/output module. Zancho discloses that a memory card or central database may serve as a donor device to store and provide preferences to application devices [column 2, lines 37-40]. When obtaining user preference from a donor device that has preferences for more than one user, information of a user such as a user code is sent to access the donor device [column 9, lines 49-55; column 10, lines 52-61]. The user code is used to select the appropriate preference for the device [column 10, line 62 to column 11, line 16]. This allows preferences to be conveniently established for users of various devices. The applicance personality selected by a user for a particular location is certainly a preference of that particular user. Thus, since Iverson discloses the need for adjusting a user interface and perceived functionality based on location or user [Iverson, column 2, lines 11-14] and selecting an appliance personality based, at least in part, on the identified location of the appliance [Iverson, column 3, lines 36-56], it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also base the selected appliance personality of Iverson, on the particular user of an applicance device by mapping and retrieving user information along with the user's associated preference information in a donor device, as taught by Zancho. The preference information containing an appliance personality associated with a location would be mapped to the user that entered it. This would allow preferences to be conveniently established for users of various devices.